

{In Archive} RE: Vacancy Memo - please provide feedback by COB 4/22

Lisauskas, Sara to: Alexandra Sullivan, Amatullah Rid Cc: "Elliott, Douglas", "Kaufman, Andrew"

04/22/2009 10:42 AM

Archive:

This message has been replied to.

This message is being viewed in an archive.

3	Alexandra Sullivan	Vacancy Memo - please provide feedback by COB 4/22
<u>a</u>	Amatullah Rid	Hi Alexandra, I would like to look more in depth at the document and p
23	Lisauskas, Sara	This looks great. I added a few very minor comments in track changes
3	Alexandra Sullivan	Sara, Thank you for the feedback. I have accepted your change
2	Amatullah Rid	Alexandra, I agree that it looks good. I have attached additional of

1 attachment



Vacancy - 20090421 - SDL.doc

This looks great. I added a few very minor comments in track changes.

Sara

----Original Message----

From: Sullivan.Alexandra@epamail.epa.gov [mailto:Sullivan.Alexandra@epamail.epa.gov]

Sent: Tuesday, April 21, 2009 5:01 PM

To: Lisauskas, Sara; Rid.Amatullah@epamail.epa.gov Subject: Vacancy Memo - please provide feedback by COB 4/22

Sara/Amatullah,

Here is the next round of the vacancy memo. I've tried to provide complete tables, etc. Please let me know what you think...preferably by COB tomorrow:) I would like to get this before Mike by the end of the week.

Thanks,

Alexandra Sullivan

U.S. EPA
ENERGY STAR
Mail Code 6202J
Washington, DC 20460
202.343.9040
sullivan.alexandra@epa.gov

(See attached file: VacancyTest - 20090420.xls) (See attached file: Vacancy - 20090421.doc)

{In Archive} Comments - Cadmus Report

Alexandra Sullivan to: Michael Zatz, Caterina Hatcher, Tracy Narel, SLisauskas, Cindy Jacobs

04/23/2009 12:13 PM

Cc: Jean Lupinacci

Archive: This message is being viewed in an archive.

)	Ô	Alexandra Sullivan	Comments - Cadmus Report
2		Tracy Narel	A couple of thoughts, even before a careful read: I'm available toda
IJ,		Alexandra Sullivan	l am available at 9:30 tomorrow. Alexandra Sullivan U.S.
a		Tracy Narel	tomorrow morning is better for me, also. *********
Ø		Lisauskas, Sara	l am available at 9:30am tomorrow, if you wa

All,

Attached please find draft comments on the Cadmus Report for the Northwest. I didn't intend to go so long...but we do have a lot of points to make so I felt that paragraph form was better than bullets. Also, I kept a lengthy discussion of model specification, because in some ways the results they present actually help to make our own case. Obviously, since this is a first draft, I am sure we can trim things down a bit, too.

At this point, I have tried to present the various concerns in a logical order. I start with the technical and move to the more program/policy. But, I didn't really write an intro or conclusion because this will depend on the final distribution list.

Next

I think we should try and send something to them by tomorrow if possible, or else very early next week. Since we are not going with a final letterhead document, we should not deliberate over the language for too long. So, it would be useful if you could offer suggestion to me by the end of the day. Also, do we want to grab a brief time to talk together to decide how/to whom this information should be distributed?

I am actually very flexible to meet this afternoon or tomorrow morning.

Thank you,

Alexandra Sullivan

U.S. EPA ENERGY STAR Mail Code 6202J Washington, DC 20460 202.343.9040 sullivan.alexandra@epa.gov



Comments_NWReport.doc



{In Archive} Re: Comments - Cadmus Report

Tracy Narel to: Alexandra Sullivan

04/23/2009 12:31 PM

Caterina Hatcher, Cindy Jacobs, Jean Lupinacci, Michael Zatz, SLisauskas

Archive:

This message is being viewed in an archive.

3	ů	Alexandra Sullivan	Comments - Cadmus Report
2		Tracy Narel	A couple of thoughts, even before a careful read: I'm available toda
3		Alexandra Sullivan	l am available at 9:30 tomorrow. Alexandra Sullivan U.S.
29		Tracy Narel	tomorrow morning is better for me, also. **********
മ		Lisauskas, Sara	l am available at 9:30am tomorrow, if you wa

A couple of thoughts, even before a careful read:

-- I'm available today after 3PM and open tomorrow.

-- Yesterday, I requested of NEEA/ETO that the report not be circulated, until further review is conducted, so we should try to move this out as soon as we can

-- Katy has done some very important work in communicating with Cadmus, who appears fully on-board with conducting further review and improving the product. The positioning that Katy has suggested of "further review is needed" I think works really well. I found that in yesterday's communications, and it will get us to the same point.

-- I would suggest the tone be something along the lines of "EPA has identified issues that we believe require further review of the analysis before the study can be considered final and circulated further."

TN

Tracy S. Narel

ENERGY STAR, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

ph: 202-343-9145 fax: 202-343-2204

e-mail: narel.tracy@epa.gov

Mailing address:

1200 Pennsylvania Ave., NW (6202J)

Washington, DC 20460

Street Address (express mail and courier):

1310 L Street, NW

Washington, DC 20005-4113

Alexandra Sullivan

All, Attached please find draft comments on the...

04/23/2009 12:13:51 PM

{In Archive} Re: Comments - Cadmus Report

Alexandra Sullivan to: Caterina Hatcher

04/23/2009 01:49 PM

Cc: Cindy Jacobs, Jean Lupinacci, Michael Zatz, "SLisauskas", Tracy Narel Archive:

This message is being viewed in an archive

I am available at 9:30 tomorrow.

Alexandra Sullivan

U.S. EPA ENERGY STAR Mail Code 6202J Washington, DC 20460 202.343.9040 sullivan.alexandra@epa.gov

Caterina Hatcher

Tracy and Alexandra, I am not sure I will have h...

04/23/2009 01:44:46 PM

From:

Caterina Hatcher/DC/USEPA/US

To:

Tracy Narel/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Alexandra Sullivan/DC/USEPA/US@EPA

Cc:

Cindy Jacobs/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Jean Lupinacci/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Michael

Zatz/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, "SLisauskas" <SLisauskas@icfi.com>

Date:

04/23/2009 01:44 PM

Subject:

Re: Comments - Cadmus Report

Tracy and Alexandra,

I am not sure I will have had a chance to read Alexandra's comments by 3pm today. Can we meet at 9:30 tomorrow morning?

Thanks,

Katy

Caterina Hatcher

Sent by EPA Wireless E-Mail Services.

Tracy Narel



{In Archive} Re: Comments - Cadmus Report

Tracy Narel to: Alexandra Sullivan

04/23/2009 03:11 PM

Caterina Hatcher, Cindy Jacobs, Jean Lupinacci, Michael Zatz, "SLisauskas"

Archive:

This message is being viewed in an archive.

3	Alexandra Sullivan	Comments - Cadmus Report
à	Tracy Narel	A couple of thoughts, even before a careful read: I'm available toda,
3	Alexandra Sullivan	l am available at 9:30 tomorrow. Alexandra Sullivan U.S. E
<u>ه</u>	Tracy Narel	tomorrow morning is better for me, also. ************************************
ß	Lisauskas, Sara	l am available at 9:30am tomorrow, if you wa

tomorrow morning is better for me, also.

Tracy S. Narel

ENERGY STAR, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

ph: 202-343-9145 fax: 202-343-2204

e-mail: narel.tracy@epa.gov

Mailing address:

1200 Pennsylvania Ave., NW (6202J)

Washington, DC 20460

Street Address (express mail and courier):

1310 L Street, NW

Washington, DC 20005-4113

Alexandra Sullivan Caterina Hatcher I am available at 9:30 tomorrow. Alexandra Sulli...

Tracy and Alexandra, I am not sure I will have h...

04/23/2009 01:49:18 PM 04/23/2009 01:44:46 PM

Tracy Narel

{In Archive} RE: Vacancy Memo - please provide feedback by COB 4/22

Alexandra Sullivan to: Lisauskas, Sara

04/23/2009 01:48 PM

Cc: Amatullah Rid

Archive: This message is being viewed in an archive.

<i>3</i>	Alexandra Sullivan	Vacancy Memo - please provide feedback by COB 4/22	
Ø.	Amatullah Rid	Hi Alexandra, I would like to look more in depth at the document and p	
۵	Lisauskas, Sara	This looks great. I added a few very minor comments in track changes	
3	Alexandra Sullivan	Sara, Thank you for the feedback. I have accepted your change	
മ	Amatullah Rid	Alexandra, I agree that it looks good. I have attached additional	

Sara,

Thank you for the feedback. I have accepted your changes. I actually was not saying "vacancy increase" intentionally. I think I was just in a hurry, and in some cases was borrowing (copy/pasting) text. So, thanks for pointing that out. Now, they all say "vacancy increase".

Alexandra Sullivan

U.S. EPA ENERGY STAR Mail Code 6202J Washington, DC 20460 202.343.9040 sullivan.alexandra@epa.gov

"Lisauskas, Sara"

This looks great. I added a few very minor com...

04/22/2009 10:42:13 AM

{In Archive} cadmus report

Cindy Jacobs to: Alexandra Sullivan

04/23/2009 02:19 PM

Archive:

This message is being viewed in an archive.

<u>a</u>	Cindy Jacobs	cadmus report	

my comments redlined on attached. ah, I just realized I saved it as camus instead of cadmus -- maybe I subconsciously wondered if it really existed...



Camus_NWReportcbj.doc

Cindy B. Jacobs U.S. EPA **ENERGY STAR** (202) 343-9045



{In Archive} RE: Vacancy Memo - please provide feedback by COB 4/22 Amatullah Rid to: Alexandra Sullivan

04/23/2009 02:39 PM

History:

This message has been replied to.

Archive:

This message is being viewed in an archive.

9	Alexandra Sullivan	Vacancy Memo - please provide feedback by COB 4/22
<u> </u>	Amatullah Rid	Hi Alexandra, I would like to look more in depth at the document and p
	Lisauskas, Sara	This looks great. I added a few very minor comments in track changes
9	Alexandra Sullivan	Sara, Thank you for the feedback. I have accepted your change
2	Amatullah Rid	Alexandra, I agree that it looks good. I have attached additional

Alexandra,

I agree that it looks good. I have attached additional comments along with Sara's. Feel free to reject or accept.



Vacancy - 20090423 - AHR.doc Amatullah R'id U.S. EPA **ENERGY STAR Commercial and Industrial Branch** Office of Air and Radiation Mail Code 6202J Washington, DC 20460 202.343.9097 rid.amatullah@epa.gov

"Lisauskas, Sara"

This looks great. I added a few very minor com...

04/22/2009 10:42:12 AM

{In Archive} RE: Energy Star scores & occupancy levels

Alexandra Sullivan to: Cathy Turner

07/06/2009 02:32 PM

Α	rchive: This m	essage is being viewed in an archive.
2	Mike Opitz	Energy Star scores & occupancy levels
3	Alexandra Sullivan	Mike, I am available any time on Friday 5/22.
ā	Mike Opitz	Thank you Alexandra, this is very helpful. I'll propose a meeting i
B	Cathy Turner	Hi Corey - Is this call still on? I can't find the call in number
<u> </u>	Corey Enck	Hi Cathy, Let's use this number:

Cathy.

We will provide something soon. We are finalizing our review of spaces other than Office.

Thanks,

Alexandra Sullivan

U.S. EPA **ENERGY STAR** Mail Code 6202J Washington, DC 20460 202.343.9040 sullivan.alexandra@epa.gov

"Cathy Turner"

Hi Alexandra, We're still hoping to make any nee...

07/06/2009 01:52:45 PM

From: To:

"Cathy Turner" <cathyt@newbuildings.org> Alexandra Sullivan/DC/USEPA/US@EPA

Date:

07/06/2009 01:52 PM

Subject:

RE: Energy Star scores & occupancy levels

Hi Alexandra,

We're still hoping to make any needed EBOM calculator changes for allowing a higher % of vacant space later this month. Is your decision memo on planned PM changes available yet for USGBC review? Thanks!

Cathy

From: Sullivan.Alexandra@epamail.epa.gov [mailto:Sullivan.Alexandra@epamail.epa.gov]

Sent: Wednesday, May 27, 2009 5:45 AM

To: Cathy Turner Cc: 'Corey Enck'

Subject: RE: Energy Star scores & occupancy levels

[Both of Alexandra's corrections incorporated in the updated "original" note below]

I agree with these notes. I have two comments:

- 1. Vacant Office in PM should be entered as office with zero workers, PCs, and hours (I think the hours may have been missing from your note, this is the most important part).
- 2. I think this may be a type:

".Any LEED max vacancy limit is no higher than the EPA limit would be fine.", do you mean:

"Any LEED max vacancy limit is higher than the EPA limit would be fine."

Thanks for taking such good notes.

Alexandra Sullivan

U.S. EPA
ENERGY STAR
Mail Code 6202J
Washington, DC 20460
202.343.9040
sullivan.alexandra@epa.gov

From: "Cathy Turner" <cathyt@newbuildings.org>

To: "'Corey Enck'" < cenck@usgbc.org >, Alexandra

Sullivan/DC/USEPA/US@EPA

Date: 05/26/2009 08:41 PM

Subject: RE: Energy Star scores & occupancy levels

Thought I should get the key points from my scribbled notes from our call transferred to some place that I might be able to find and read them in the future. Let me know if you have any changes / additions. Thanks!

--- Corrected version:

EPA / Energy Star treatment of vacant space

- 1. Expect changes to be implemented in an August or September PM mini-release. Decision/Analysis memo should be available by end of June.
- 2. Vacancy limits currently apply for E* only to office and hotel space types. That will probably continue to be the case, but they are reviewing the other types to confirm. Medical office would be one of the most likely other types to also be included in the revision.
- 3. Max allowable vacant space for offices may be dropped to 50%. Testing shows that their proposed approach is fairly robust down that level.

4. For offices, will require vacant and occupied areas to be entered as separate spaces within the building, with 0 for each of hours, occupants, and PC's in the vacant area.

USGBC / EB considerations (energy-related)
5. Could announce a change in the EBOM vacancy requirement in July (after the EPA E* decision is known, but a month or two before the change is actually implemented in PM). Any LEED max vacancy limit that is no higher than the EPA limit would be fine. (e.g., if EPA goes to 50% vacancy, LEED could stay at 75% or drop to 60%.)

- 6. For E*-eligible buildings (EBOM 2009 Case 1), no need to change the offline (Case 2) calculator. [Note, this assumes USGBC is comfortable with no E*rating adjustments for different vacancy levels in the unaffected types (#2 above). Seems a reasonable assumption, given the EPA review process, but could confirm after their analysis memo is available.]
- 7. For Case 2 buildings, probably want to add a requirement to the offline calculator that vacant space be separately identified, at least if it exceeds x%. Will need to do some sensitivity and reasonability testing to make sure the point impacts look reasonable and don't create a sharp discontinuity in ratings for vacancy levels just above and below x%.

My preliminary recommendation here was that the calculator use the source EUI for "general storage" (56 source kBtu/sf) as the Nat'l Avg for the vacant spaces. This is less than half of the CBECS average for most space types, (e.g. 102 source kBtu/sf for social/meeting, 246 for library). Probably on the conservative side (e.g. a lower national average benchmark than might be argued for), but we don't have data to make a more refined or accurate estimate. I'm assuming that the same vacant EUI would make sense for all non-E* types. The EUI differences by type come primarily from differences in schedule and plug/equipment loads. Those things should apply only to the occupied space. Other thoughts?

8. Plan to implement these changes in the offline calculator in July (assuming the USGBC announcement of vacancy changes will happen about then). ALSO, update the Case 1 / Case 2 type lists at the same time to reflect that Religious Worship will be moving to the Case 1 (E* eligible) type as of the end of July.

----Original Message----

From: Mike Opitz [?mailto:mopitz@usgbc.org]

Sent: Monday, May 11, 2009 10:31 AM

To: Sullivan.Alexandra@epamail.epa.gov

Cc: Cathy Turner; Corey Enck

Subject: RE: Energy Star scores & occupancy levels

Thank you Alexandra, this is very helpful. I'll propose a meeting for us soon.

----Original Message-----

From: Sullivan.Alexandra@epamail.epa.gov [mailto:Sullivan.Alexandra@epamail.epa.gov:]

Sent: Monday, May 11, 2009 11:47 AM

To: Mike Opitz

Cc: Cathy Turner; Corey Enck

Subject: Re: Energy Star scores & occupancy levels

Mike,

I am available any time on Friday 5/22.

EPA is working to finalize our analysis of this issue. As a preview of our review: given the adjustments for hours of operation, worker density and PC density, we believe that the office rating model will work well and compute accurate ratings at lower occupancy levels. The only requirement is that the vacant space should be input with zero hours of operation.

Because we do not work as much with new buildings, the occupancy question is less of an issue for other space types. But, these are under review, too. I do not think we will develop requirements for spaces such as retail stores, hospitals or schools. These do not typically have high vacancy levels.

Thanks, Alexandra Sullivan

U.S. EPA **ENERGY STAR** Mail Code 6202J Washington, DC 20460 202.343.9040 sullivan.alexandra@epa.gov

From:

"Mike Opitz" <mopitz@usgbc.org>

"Cathy Turner" < cathyt@newbuildings.org>, Alexandra To: Sullivan/DC/USEPA/US@EPA

"Corey Enck" < cenck@usgbc.org> Cc:

Date:

05/11/2009 11:41 AM

Subject:

Energy Star scores & occupancy levels

Hello Cathy and Alexandra:

Hope things are going well your way.

Corey and I are interested in having a follow-up technical discussion with both of you on one of the items we discussed together at our meeting a few months back: the sensitivity of Energy Star scores to occupancy levels for some applications, and whether defining more boundaries on that issue makes sense for our respective programs. Are there any good times in the near future that you could meet with us on this?

Thank you,

Mike Opitz PE, LEED Accredited Professional
Vice President, LEED Implementation
U.S. Green Building Council
2101 L Street NW | Suite 500 | Washington DC 20037
202.828.7422 (main)
202.742.3744 (direct)
MOpitz@usgbc.org

{In Archive} Re: occupancy levels

Alexandra Sullivan to: Cathy Turner

This message is being viewed in an archive.

05/26/2009 05:06 PM

2	Cathy Turner	occupancy levels
3	Alexandra Sullivan	Cathy, We applied the 50% on a source basis. We will review this mo

Cathy,

Archive:

We applied the 50% on a source basis. We will review this more closely, but I believe that even if you assume a 30% gas as compared with 100% electric, the range based on our end use calcs was still close to 50 (that is, 48-52 or something).

Thanks,

Alexandra Sullivan

U.S. EPA **ENERGY STAR** Mail Code 6202J Washington, DC 20460 202.343.9040 sullivan.alexandra@epa.gov

"Cathy Turner"

When you assumed EUIs for vacant space at 50...

05/26/2009 02:50:50 PM

From: To:

"Cathy Turner" <cathyt@newbuildings.org> Alexandra Sullivan/DC/USEPA/US@EPA

Date:

05/26/2009 02:50 PM

Subject:

occupancy levels

When you assumed EUIs for vacant space at 50% of those for occupied space, was that on a site or source basis? I was assuming site, just because that's what I usually work with. But, if it was a source EUI number, in a gas-heated building, it sounds a little low? (because the reduction comes disproportionately from electricity on a site basis) ct

----Original Message----

From: Corey Enck [mailto:cenck@usgbc.org]

Sent: Tuesday, May 26, 2009 10:03 AM

To: Cathy Turner

Cc: Alexandra Sullivan

Subject: RE: Energy Star scores & occupancy levels

Hi Cathy,

Let's use this number:

1 866 469 3239

Participant code: 874 22 013

Corey

----Original Message----

From: Cathy Turner [mailto:cathyt@newbuildings.org]

Sent: Tuesday, May 26, 2009 1:02 PM

To: Corey Enck

Cc: Alexandra Sullivan

Subject: RE: Energy Star scores & occupancy levels

Hi Corey - Is this call still on? I can't find the call in number.

Alexandra and I are both available/ready.

Cathy

----Original Message----

From: Mike Opitz [mailto:mopitz@usgbc.org]

Sent: Monday, May 11, 2009 10:31 AM To: Sullivan.Alexandra@epamail.epa.gov

Cc: Cathy Turner; Corey Enck

Subject: RE: Energy Star scores & occupancy levels

Thank you Alexandra, this is very helpful. I'll propose a meeting for us soon.

Mike

----Original Message----

From: Sullivan.Alexandra@epamail.epa.gov [mailto:Sullivan.Alexandra@epamail.epa.gov]

Sent: Monday, May 11, 2009 11:47 AM

To: Mike Opitz

Cc: Cathy Turner; Corey Enck

Subject: Re: Energy Star scores & occupancy levels

Mike,

I am available any time on Friday 5/22.

EPA is working to finalize our analysis of this issue. As a preview of our review: given the adjustments for hours of operation, worker density and PC density, we believe that the office rating model will work well and compute accurate ratings at lower occupancy levels. The only requirement is that the vacant space should be input with zero hours of operation.

Because we do not work as much with new buildings, the occupancy question is less of an issue for other space types. But, these are under review, too. I do not think we will develop requirements for spaces such as retail stores, hospitals or schools. These do not typically have high vacancy levels.

Thanks, Alexandra Sullivan U.S. EPA
ENERGY STAR
Mail Code 6202J
Washington, DC 20460
202.343.9040
sullivan.alexandra@epa.gov

From:

"Mike Opitz" <mopitz@usgbc.org>

To: "Cathy Turner" <cathyt@newbuildings.org>, Alexandra Sullivan/DC/USEPA/US@EPA

Cc:

"Corey Enck" <cenck@usgbc.org>

Date:

05/11/2009 11:41 AM

Subject:

Energy Star scores & occupancy levels

Hello Cathy and Alexandra:

Hope things are going well your way.

Corey and I are interested in having a follow-up technical discussion with both of you on one of the items we discussed together at our meeting a few months back: the sensitivity of Energy Star scores to occupancy levels for some applications, and whether defining more boundaries on that issue makes sense for our respective programs. Are there any good times in the near future that you could meet with us on this?

Thank you,

Mike Opitz PE, LEED Accredited Professional Vice President, LEED Implementation U.S. Green Building Council 2101 L Street NW | Suite 500 | Washington DC 20037 202.828.7422 (main) 202.742.3744 (direct) MOpitz@usgbc.org

{In Archive} Energy Star Score and Weather Data

Alexandra Sullivan to: Mike Opitz

Cc: Michael Zatz

Archive:

This message is being viewed in an archive

	Tills filess	sage is being viewed in an archive.
2	Mike Opitz	Energy Star scores & occupancy levels
3	Alexandra Sullivan	Mike, I am available any time on Friday 5/22.
<u> </u>	Mike Opitz	Thank you Alexandra, this is very helpful. I'll propose a meeting to
2	Cathy Turner	Hi Corey - Is this call still on? I can't find the call in number
à	Corey Enck	Hi Cathy, Let's use this number:

06/04/2009 04:58 PM

Mike,

Per my voicemail, EPA recently instituted a slight change to the procedure for incorporating weather data into a rating.

Old Method

When you entered your April bill on May 2, weather data for April was not available. So, rather than use the as-experience HDD and CDD values, PM would use the 30-year average values. Then, later in May when the weather data became available, your rating would change, to reflect the as-experienced value. For most buildings this change in rating was very small (about 2 points). However, the fact that ratings changed at all was a source of question and concern from partners.

New Method

Display NA for a building during the interim period when they have energy data entered, but weather data is not yet available from NOAA. So, for example if you enter your April bill on May 2, you would see NA for your rating until weather data became available (around May 21). Although this has a period with NA, once a rating is displayed, it is not subject to change. So you will never have a situation where a building logs in one day and sees a rating and then the next day and sees a different rating. Ultimately we feel this is a more appropriate approach. A rating is not displayed until it can be accurately computed with the official weather data.

Intersection with LEED

We have heard some concern from our partners, that this could result in difficulties meeting the following two LEED requirements:

- 1. All of your credit measurement pieces must have a period ending within 7 days of each other.
- 2. After your period ending you have 60 days to submit your documentation.

If they want to select April 30 as their period ending date, the could have to wait until the third week of May to have their Rating and SEP ready (which means they won't know for sure what their rating is, or how many points they can get). As such, when they finally get the SEP, they will really have less than 60 days to complete the LEED documentation.

At EPA we generally consider an SEP to be good for 120 days from the period ending date. So, an SEP for the period ending March 31st is good for 4 months (until July 30th). From this perspective, you may want to consider whether there is an opportunity to allow your applicants some flexibility on the period ending date so that they can have more time to compile all of their requisite documentation. This decisions is completely up to you at USGBC. I know you have a lot of priorities to balance, so you should make the decision that is best for you. But, we are hearing from our partners that the timing right now can be tight.

Thank you,

Alexandra Sullivan

U.S. EPA ENERGY STAR Mail Code 6202J Washington, DC 20460 202.343.9040 sullivan.alexandra@epa.gov

{In Archive} RE: Energy Star Score and Weather Data

Alexandra Sullivan to: Mike Opitz

Cc: "Corey Enck", Michael Zatz

Archive:

This message is being viewed in an archive.

2	Mike Opitz	Energy Star scores & occupancy levels	
3	Alexandra Sullivan	Mike, I am available any time on Friday 5/22.	
<u> </u>	Mike Opitz	Thank you Alexandra, this is very helpful. I'll propose a meeting i	
2	Cathy Turner	Hi Corey - Is this call still on? I can't find the call in number	
<u> </u>	Corey Enck	Hi Cathy, Let's use this number:	

Mike,

Thanks for the quick reply.

I understand that for your own program you would rather hear directly from your stakeholders without me as an intermediary. I have given the few partners who have been contacting us about this issue your information so that they may contact you directly with their questions and concerns.

As you work to understand the questions and issues, I am happy to participate in a call to discuss any potential changes, etc.

Thanks, Alexandra Sullivan

U.S. EPA ENERGY STAR Mail Code 6202J Washington, DC 20460 202.343.9040 sullivan.alexandra@epa.gov

"Mike Opitz"

Thank you Alexandra for bringing this to my atte...

06/05/2009 11:00:05 AM

06/05/2009 01:40 PM

From:

"Mike Opitz" <mopitz@usgbc.org>

To:

Alexandra Sullivan/DC/USEPA/US@EPA

Cc:

Michael Zatz/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, "Corey Enck" <cenck@usgbc.org>

Date:

06/05/2009 11:00 AM

Subject:

RE: Energy Star Score and Weather Data

Thank you Alexandra for bringing this to my attention. These look like good changes to the tool and I'm glad to see them happen.

I'd be interested in discussing the concerns raised by your partners directly with them. Do you think they'd be interested in having a conversation with us about the issues, and if so, could you let me know who they are so I could proceed with setting that up?

Thank you,

Mike Opitz PE, LEED Accredited Professional Vice President, LEED Implementation U.S. Green Building Council Suite 500 | Washington DC 20037 2101 L Street NW 202.828.7422 (main) 202.742.3744 (direct) MOpitz@usqbc.org

----Original Message----

From: Sullivan.Alexandra@epamail.epa.gov [mailto:Sullivan.Alexandra@epamail.epa.gov] Sent: Thursday, June 04, 2009 4:58 PM

To: Mike Opitz

Cc: Zatz.Michael@epamail.epa.gov

Subject: Energy Star Score and Weather Data

Mike,

Per my voicemail, EPA recently instituted a slight change to the procedure for incorporating weather data into a rating.

Old Method

When you entered your April bill on May 2, weather data for April was not available. So, rather than use the as-experience HDD and CDD values, PM would use the 30-year average values. Then, later in May when the weather data became available, your rating would change, to reflect the as-experienced value. For most buildings this change in rating was very small (about 2 points). However, the fact that ratings changed at all was a source of question and concern from partners.

New Method

Display NA for a building during the interim period when they have energy data entered, but weather data is not yet available from NOAA. So, for example if you enter your April bill on May 2, you would see NA for your rating until weather data became available (around May 21). Although this has a period with NA, once a rating is displayed, it is not subject to change. So you will never have a situation where a building logs in one day and sees a rating and then the next day and sees a different rating. Ultimately we feel this is a more appropriate approach. A rating is not displayed until it can be accurately computed with the official weather data.

Intersection with LEED

We have heard some concern from our partners, that this could result in difficulties meeting the following two LEED requirements:

- 1. All of your credit measurement pieces must have a period ending within 7 days of each other.
- 2. After your period ending you have 60 days to submit your documentation.

If they want to select April 30 as their period ending date, the could have to wait until the third week of May to have their Rating and SEP ready (which means they won't know for sure what their rating is, or how many points they can get). As such, when they finally get the SEP, they will really have less than 60 days to complete the LEED documentation.

At EPA we generally consider an SEP to be good for 120 days from the period ending date. So, an SEP for the period ending March 31st is good for 4 months (until July 30th). From this perspective, you may want to consider whether there is an opportunity to allow your applicants some flexibility on the period ending date so that they can have more time to compile all of their requisite documentation. This decisions is completely up to you at USGBC. I know you have a lot of priorities to balance, so you should make the decision that is best for you. But, we are hearing from our partners that the timing right now can be tight.

Thank you,

Alexandra Sullivan

U.S. EPA
ENERGY STAR
Mail Code 6202J
Washington, DC 20460
202.343.9040
sullivan.alexandra@epa.gov



{In Archive} RE: Energy Star Buildings in NYC - Issues in NY vs Nat'l Portfolios

Feuer, Josh to: Alexandra Sullivan, Scarola, Thomas Cc: Jean Lupinacci, Hingea, rplatt

06/22/2009 09:39 AM

History:

This message has been replied to.

Archive:

This message is being viewed in an archive.

3	Alexandra Sullivan	Fw: Energy Star Buildings in NYC - Issues in NY vs Nat'l Portfolios
	Feuer, Josh	Hi Alexandra, Tom and I are looking at our schedules and wondering it
3	Alexandra Sullivan	HI Josh, As a representative of EPA, I will be testifying on Frid
<u>a</u>	Feuer, Josh	Ok great - I think this will work. I will grab a place and To
3	Alexandra Sullivan	Josh, I misspoke yesterday when I was looking at my calenda

Hi Alexandra,

Tom and I are looking at our schedules and wondering if you had any time on Thursday afternoon around 4?

We are also wondering what role you are playing in the hearings on Friday and if we should at this point involve some folks from the city like Laurie Kerr and Hillary Beber? Have you been working with anyone else from the city?

Looking forward to meeting with you.

Thanks, Josh

----Original Message----

From: Sullivan.Alexandra@epamail.epa.gov [mailto:Sullivan.Alexandra@epamail.epa.gov]

Sent: Friday, June 19, 2009 4:51 PM

To: Scarola, Thomas

Cc: Lupinacci.Jean@epamail.epa.gov; Hingea@aol.com;

rplatt@rer.org;

Feuer, Josh

Subject: Fw: Energy Star Buildings in NYC - Issues in

NY vs Nat'l Portfolios

Hi Tom,

Jean forwarded me your email, and noted that you still had a number of technical questions regarding the ENERGY STAR ratings. I wanted to let you know that I will be up in New York City next week

for Friday's hearing at the City Council. I will arrive around midday on Thursday, and would be able to meet with you that afternoon if you would like the opportunity to ask more specific detailed questions about our regression analysis and technical methodology. Any time from 2 pm onward will work for me.

Please let me know if you would find a meeting helpful and if you are available on Thursday afternoon.

Thank you,

Alexandra Sullivan

U.S. EPA
ENERGY STAR
Mail Code 6202J
Washington, DC 20460
202.343.9040
sullivan.alexandra@epa.gov

---- Forwarded by Alexandra Sullivan/DC/USEPA/US on 06/19/2009 04:43 PM

From:

Jean Lupinacci/DC/USEPA/US

To:

Alexandra Sullivan/DC/USEPA/US@EPA

Date:

06/19/2009 04:38 PM

Subject: Fw: Energy Star Buildings in NYC - Issues in NY vs Nat'l Portfolios

Jean Lupinacci U.S EPA 6202J Washington DC 20460

Phone: (202) 343-9137

Email: lupinacci.jean@epa.gov

www.energystar.gov

---- Forwarded by Jean Lupinacci/DC/USEPA/US on

From: "Scarola, Thomas" <TScarola@TishmanSpeyer.com>

To: Jean Lupinacci/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, <Hingea@aol.com>, <rplatt@rer.org>, "Feuer, Josh" <JFeuer@TishmanSpeyer.com>

Date:

06/18/2009 03:52 PM

Subject: Re: Energy Star Buildings in NYC - Issues in NY vs Nat'l Portfolios

Jean,

Thanks for spending a few more minutes with me after the meeting yesterday. Maybe it gave me a chance to sound less belligerent and cranky. You obviously are open to making the tool answer all of its expectations and care deeply about it being meaningful in how it is applied.

I look forward to more conversations with you as we develop our thoughts and seek ways of achieving what appear to be mutual goals.

Regards, Tom

---- Original Message ---From: Lupinacci.Jean@epamail.epa.gov
<Lupinacci.Jean@epamail.epa.gov>
To: Hingea@aol.com <Hingea@aol.com>
Cc: Feuer, Josh; jim_green@hines.com
<jim_green@hines.com>;
rbachia@brookfieldproperties.com
<rbachia@brookfieldproperties.com>;
rplatt@rer.org <rplatt@rer.org>; Scarola, Thomas
Sent: Thu May 28 16:27:23 2009
Subject: Re: Energy Star Buildings in NYC - Issues in

NY vs Nat'l Portfolios

Adam,

Thank you for including me on the distribution of the email. If any questions arise as you proceed with this evaluation please let me know.
We look forward to hearing any issues that may be identified.

Jean

Jean Lupinacci U.S EPA 6202J Washington DC 20460

Phone: (202) 343-9137

Email: lupinacci.jean@epa.gov

www.energystar.gov

From: Hingea@aol.com

Cc: Jean Lupinacci/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, tscarola@tishmanspeyer.com

Date: 05/27/2009 08:03 AM

Subject: Energy Star Buildings in NYC - Issues in NY vs Nat'l Portfolios

As I've discussed with each of you in the past few weeks, a variety of questions still arise periodically about issues with Energy Star Portfolio Manager treatment of large office buildings in NYC.

With the prospect of some national legislation including reference to Energy Star, Roger Platt of the Real Estate Roundtable had asked me a

couple of months ago about any ways to isolate which issues are real and might be addressed by EPA, vs what are remaining perception issues. As all of you have significant holdings in NYC and other cities around the US, and have benchmarked most (or all) of those buildings, you would have the best perspective on how NYC buildings might be operated and rated differently from those in other cities, and whether there are any substantive issues that we might identify for EPA's consideration.

Jim, as you're the only owner rep not based in NYC, could you let us know some days in the next week or two (beginning 6/1) that you'd be in NY and available to meet? If it would be easier to schedule a conference call instead of meeting in person, that is fine; please suggest some dates/times that would work.

Thanks, Adam



{In Archive} RE: Energy Star Buildings in NYC - Issues in NY vs Nat'l Portfolios

Feuer, Josh to: Alexandra Sullivan

Cc: "Scarola, Thomas"

06/24/2009 10:22 AM

History:

This message has been replied to.

Archive:

This message is being viewed in an archive

11110 1110000		age is being viewed in an archive.	
3	Alexandra Sullivan	Fw: Energy Star Buildings in NYC - Issues in NY vs Nat'l Portfolios	
Ø	Feuer, Josh	Hi Alexandra, Tom and I are looking at our schedules and wondering if	
3	Alexandra Sullivan	HI Josh, As a representative of EPA, I will be testifying on Frid	
2 3	Feuer, Josh	Ok great - I think this will work. I will grab a place and Tom	
3	Alexandra Sullivan	Josh, I misspoke yesterday when I was looking at my calenda	

Are you available at 2:30?

----Original Message----

From: Sullivan.Alexandra@epamail.epa.gov [mailto:Sullivan.Alexandra@epamail.epa.gov] Sent: Wednesday, June 24, 2009 10:03 AM

To: Feuer, Josh Cc: Scarola, Thomas

Subject: RE: Energy Star Buildings in NYC - Issues in

NY vs Nat'l Portfolios

Josh,

5:30 works for me, Tom are you available?

Alexandra Sullivan

U.S. EPA ENERGY STAR Mail Code 6202J Washington, DC 20460 202.343.9040 sullivan.alexandra@epa.gov

From: "Feuer, Josh" <JFeuer@TishmanSpeyer.com>

To:

Alexandra Sullivan/DC/USEPA/US@EPA

Cc: "Scarola, Thomas" <TScarola@TishmanSpeyer.com>

Date:

06/24/2009 10:01 AM

Subject: RE: Energy Star Buildings in NYC -

Issues in NY vs Nat'l

Portfolios

I have a call at 5 - I can do 5:30

----Original Message----

From: Sullivan.Alexandra@epamail.epa.gov [mailto:Sullivan.Alexandra@epamail.epa.gov] Sent: Wednesday, June 24, 2009 10:01 AM

To: Feuer, Josh Cc: Scarola, Thomas

Subject: RE: Energy Star Buildings in NYC - Issues in

NY vs Nat'l Portfolios

Josh,

I misspoke yesterday when I was looking at my calendar. I have a meeting from 4-5 this afternoon that I cannot re-schedule. I am available to speak with you and Tom at 3 pm or at 5 pm this afternoon.

Does one of these times work for you?

Thank you, Alexandra Sullivan

U.S. EPA ENERGY STAR Mail Code 6202J Washington, DC 20460 202.343.9040 sullivan.alexandra@epa.gov

From: "Feuer, Josh" <JFeuer@TishmanSpeyer.com>

To: Alexandra Sullivan/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, "Scarola, Thomas" <TScarola@TishmanSpeyer.com>

Cc: Jean Lupinacci/DC/USEPA/US@EPA,
<Hingea@aol.com>,
<rplatt@rer.org>

Date:

06/22/2009 09:39 AM

Subject: RE: Energy Star Buildings in NYC - Issues in NY vs Nat'l Portfolios

Hi Alexandra,

Tom and I are looking at our schedules and wondering if you had any time on Thursday afternoon around 4?

We are also wondering what role you are playing in the hearings on Friday and if we should at this point involve some folks from the city like Laurie Kerr and Hillary Beber? Have you been working with anyone else from the city?

Looking forward to meeting with you.

Thanks, Josh

----Original Message---From: Sullivan.Alexandra@epamail.epa.gov
[mailto:Sullivan.Alexandra@epamail.epa.gov]
Sent: Friday, June 19, 2009 4:51 PM
To: Scarola, Thomas
Cc: Lupinacci.Jean@epamail.epa.gov; Hingea@aol.com; rplatt@rer.org;
Feuer, Josh
Subject: Fw: Energy Star Buildings in NYC - Issues in NY vs Nat'l
Portfolios

Hi Tom,

Jean forwarded me your email, and noted that you still had a number of technical questions regarding the ENERGY STAR ratings. I wanted to let you know that I will be up in New York City next week

for Friday's hearing at the City Council. I will arrive around midday on Thursday, and would be able to meet with you that afternoon if you would like the opportunity to ask more specific detailed questions about our regression analysis and technical methodology. Any time from 2 pm onward will work for me.

Please let me know if you would find a meeting helpful and if you are available on Thursday afternoon.

Thank you,

Alexandra Sullivan

U.S. EPA
ENERGY STAR
Mail Code 6202J
Washington, DC 20460
202.343.9040
sullivan.alexandra@epa.gov

---- Forwarded by Alexandra Sullivan/DC/USEPA/US on 06/19/2009 04:43 PM

From:

Jean Lupinacci/DC/USEPA/US

To:

Alexandra Sullivan/DC/USEPA/US@EPA

Date:

06/19/2009 04:38 PM

Subject: Fw: Energy Star Buildings in NYC - Issues in NY vs Nat'l Portfolios

Jean Lupinacci U.S EPA 6202J Washington DC 20460

Phone: (202) 343-9137

Email: lupinacci.jean@epa.gov

www.energystar.gov

---- Forwarded by Jean Lupinacci/DC/USEPA/US on

From: "Scarola, Thomas" <TScarola@TishmanSpeyer.com>

To: Jean Lupinacci/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, <Hingea@aol.com>, <rplatt@rer.org>, "Feuer, Josh" <JFeuer@TishmanSpeyer.com>

Date:

06/18/2009 03:52 PM

Subject: Re: Energy Star Buildings in NYC - Issues in NY vs Nat'l Portfolios

Jean,

Thanks for spending a few more minutes with me after the meeting yesterday. Maybe it gave me a chance to sound less belligerent and cranky. You obviously are open to making the tool answer all of its expectations and care deeply about it being meaningful in how it is applied.

I look forward to more conversations with you as we develop our thoughts and seek ways of achieving what appear to be mutual goals.

Regards, Tom

---- Original Message ---From: Lupinacci.Jean@epamail.epa.gov
<Lupinacci.Jean@epamail.epa.gov>
To: Hingea@aol.com <Hingea@aol.com>
Cc: Feuer, Josh; jim_green@hines.com
<jim_green@hines.com>;
rbachia@brookfieldproperties.com
<rbachia@brookfieldproperties.com>;
rplatt@rer.org <rplatt@rer.org>; Scarola, Thomas
Sent: Thu May 28 16:27:23 2009
Subject: Re: Energy Star Buildings in NYC - Issues in

NY vs Nat'l Portfolios

Adam,

Thank you for including me on the distribution of the email. If any questions arise as you proceed with this evaluation please let me know.

We look forward to hearing any issues that may be identified.

Jean

Jean Lupinacci U.S EPA 6202J Washington DC 20460

Phone: (202) 343-9137

Email: lupinacci.jean@epa.gov

www.energystar.gov

From: Hingea@aol.com

To: rbachia@brookfieldproperties.com, jim_green@hines.com, JFeuer@TishmanSpeyer.com, rplatt@rer.org

Cc: Jean Lupinacci/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, tscarola@tishmanspeyer.com

Date: 05/27/2009 08:03 AM

Subject: Energy Star Buildings in NYC - Issues in NY vs Nat'l Portfolios

As I've discussed with each of you in the past few weeks, a variety of questions still arise periodically about issues with Energy Star Portfolio Manager treatment of large office buildings in NYC.

With the prospect of some national legislation including reference to Energy Star, Roger Platt of the Real Estate Roundtable had asked me a

couple of months ago about any ways to isolate which issues are real and might be addressed by EPA, vs what are remaining perception issues. As all of you have significant holdings in NYC and other cities around the US, and have benchmarked most (or all) of those buildings, you would have the best perspective on how NYC buildings might be operated and rated differently from those in other cities, and whether there are any substantive issues that we might identify for EPA's consideration.

Jim, as you're the only owner rep not based in NYC, could you let us know some days in the next week or two (beginning 6/1) that you'd be in NY and available to meet? If it would be easier to schedule a conference call instead of meeting in person, that is fine; please suggest some dates/times that would work.

Thanks, Adam

Sustainable Energy Partnerships

voice: (914)584-0030; fax: (914)524-7706)

{In Archive} RE: Energy Star Buildings in NYC - Issues in NY vs Nat'l Portfolios Alexandra Sullivan to: Scarola, Thomas Cc: "Feuer, Josh" 106/25/2009 07:56 AM

Ar	chive: This messa	age is being viewed in an archive.	
2	Scarola, Thomas	Alexandra,	
<u> </u>	Alexandra Sullivan	Tom, I'm glad you were able to join us for this call. As a quick for	
3	Scarola, Thomas	thanks Alexandra	
3	Alexandra Sullivan	Hi Tom, The answers to these questions are as follows:	

Hi Tom,

The answers to these questions are as follows:

The next CBECS Survey will be the 2007 Survey. This survey was conducted during 2008 and EIA is using 2009 to process results and verify energy information with utility companies. The data from this survey is not yet available to the public, or to EPA. Some basic information (like the number of buildings) may become available by the end of the year. The energy data will not be available until 2010, probably late in the year.

When the data become available, EPA will revise the regression approach, a process which takes several months of analysis. As such, it is not likely that a new model will be released in Portfolio Manager until late 2011. However, at this time it is not possible to develop an exact schedule.

Because EPA does not have the data for the 2007 survey, there is nothing we can do to compare it with 2003. We will perform this type of analysis when the data become available, in late 2010.

Whenever a new regression model is released into Portfolio Manager all of the ratings change, including the ratings for buildings that have already been rated. Because all of the ratings change, your past improvements will still be captured. If you have buildings where you have achieved 20% improvements in energy efficiency, you new (revised) ratings will still show that improvement, because both the baseline and current rating will change to reflect the new EPA algorithms.

Whenever ratings change due to a new regression model, EPA does not take away any past recognition, and labels that have been awarded are still considered valid.

Table B6 is created by EIA. When the new survey data is made available, they generally recreate all of the tables. The exact order and timing of this process will depend on their priorities, so I do not know the exact process. In my experience, those tables are usually available at the same time as public data release

Hopefully this helps.

Alexandra Sullivan

U.S. EPA ENERGY STAR Mail Code 6202J Washington, DC 20460 202.343.9040

sullivan.alexandra@epa.gov

"Scarola, Thomas" thanks Alexandra

06/25/2009 07:04:19 AM

From: "Scarola, Thomas" <TScarola@TishmanSpeyer.com>

To: Alexandra Sullivan/DC/USEPA/US@EPA
Cc: "Feuer, Josh" <JFeuer@TishmanSpeyer.com>

Date: 06/25/2009 07:04 AM

Subject: RE: Energy Star Buildings in NYC - Issues in NY vs Nat'l Portfolios

thanks Alexandra

These doesn't have to be answered right away but these are some other questions. They might also be in the link you sent and I will look there.

when is the next set of CBECS survey data going in to effect?

is the data already gathered being compared to the 2003 survey data?

will the new data base alter Energy Star scores on buildings previously rated?

is the mix of surveyed buildings available to look at as in Table B6 for the 2003 survey?

have new regression formulas for the new data been established yet?

safe trip to NYC

From: Sullivan.Alexandra@epamail.epa.gov [mailto:Sullivan.Alexandra@epamail.epa.gov]

Sent: Wed 6/24/2009 6:31 PM

To: Scarola, Thomas Cc: Feuer, Josh

Subject: RE: Energy Star Buildings in NYC - Issues in NY vs Nat'l Portfolios

Tom,

I'm glad you were able to join us for this call. As a quick follow-up I am attaching a link to the public data, CBECS. From this main page you can access summary tables, but also the specific microdata (that is, the exact survey responses for all observations). http://www.eia.doe.gov/emeu/cbecs/contents.html

As I noted, if you supply the information listed in Step 1 of the Office Model Technical Description, I can re-create the example calculations and table for you and your specific building. Hopefully this may help us work through some of your questions.

I hope you found our discussion helpful,

Alexandra Sullivan

U.S. EPA

ENERGY STAR
Mail Code 6202J
Washington, DC 20460
202.343.9040
sullivan.alexandra@epa.gov

From:

"Scarola, Thomas" <TScarola@TishmanSpeyer.com>

To:

Alexandra Sullivan/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, "Feuer, Josh"

<JFeuer@TishmanSpeyer.com>

Date:

06/24/2009 05:14 PM

Subject:

RE: Energy Star Buildings in NYC - Issues in NY vs Nat'l

Portfolios

Alexandra,

I am not sure if I will be able to join the call.

My questions start with page 5 of the methodology document and carries through to page 4 of the office technical document. Is it possible to see real values put in to the regression formulas either for the CBECS source data or a specific project entered in to Energy Star?

If I did see numbers, would it mean anything to me in understanding my building?

Hold to see if I make the call before answering this.

thanks

From: Sullivan.Alexandra@epamail.epa.gov [mailto:Sullivan.Alexandra@epamail.epa.gov]

Sent: Wed 6/24/2009 11:06 AM

To: Feuer; Josh Cc: Scarola, Thomas

Subject: RE: Energy Star Buildings in NYC - Issues in NY vs Nat'l

Portfolios

Unfortunately not. I am only available from 3-4 pm or after 5.

Alexandra Sullivan

U.S. EPA ENERGY STAR Mail Code 6202J Washington, DC 20460 202.343.9040 sullivan.alexandra@epa.gov

From: "Feuer, Josh" <JFeuer@TishmanSpeyer.com>

To: Alexandra Sullivan/DC/USEPA/US@EPA

Cc: "Scarola, Thomas" <TScarola@TishmanSpeyer.com>

Date: 06/24/2009 10:22 AM

Subject: RE: Energy Star Buildings in NYC - Issues in NY vs Nat'l

Portfolios

Are you available at 2:30?

----Original Message----

From: Sullivan.Alexandra@epamail.epa.gov [mailto:Sullivan.Alexandra@epamail.epa.gov] Sent: Wednesday, June 24, 2009 10:03 AM

To: Feuer, Josh Cc: Scarola, Thomas

Subject: RE: Energy Star Buildings in NYC - Issues in NY vs Nat'l

Portfolios

Josh,

5:30 works for me, Tom are you available?

Alexandra Sullivan

U.S. EPA ENERGY STAR Mail Code 6202J Washington, DC 20460 202.343.9040 sullivan.alexandra@epa.gov

From: "Feuer, Josh" <JFeuer@TishmanSpeyer.com>

To: Alexandra Sullivan/DC/USEPA/US@EPA

Cc:

"Scarola, Thomas" <TScarola@TishmanSpeyer.com>

Date:

06/24/2009 10:01 AM

Subject:

RE: Energy Star Buildings in NYC - Issues in NY vs Nat'l

Portfolios

I have a call at 5 - I can do 5:30

----Original Message----

From: Sullivan.Alexandra@epamail.epa.gov [mailto:Sullivan.Alexandra@epamail.epa.gov] Sent: Wednesday, June 24, 2009 10:01 AM

To: Feuer, Josh Cc: Scarola, Thomas

Subject: RE: Energy Star Buildings in NYC - Issues in NY vs Nat'l

Portfolios

Josh,

I misspoke yesterday when I was looking at my calendar. I have a meeting from 4-5 this afternoon that I cannot re-schedule. I am available to speak with you and Tom at 3 pm or at 5 pm this afternoon. Does one of these times work for you?

Thank you, Alexandra Sullivan

U.S. EPA ENERGY STAR Mail Code 6202J Washington, DC 20460 202.343.9040 sullivan.alexandra@epa.gov

From:

"Feuer, Josh" <JFeuer@TishmanSpeyer.com>

Alexandra Sullivan/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, "Scarola, Thomas" <TScarola@TishmanSpeyer.com>

Jean Lupinacci/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, <Hingea@aol.com>, <rplatt@rer.org>

Date:

06/22/2009 09:39 AM

Subject:

RE: Energy Star Buildings in NYC - Issues in NY vs Nat'l

Portfolios

Hi Alexandra,

Tom and I are looking at our schedules and wondering if you had any time on Thursday afternoon around 4?

We are also wondering what role you are playing in the hearings on Friday and if we should at this point involve some folks from the city like Laurie Kerr and Hillary Beber? Have you been working with anyone else from the city?

Looking forward to meeting with you.

Thanks, Josh

----Original Message-----

From: Sullivan.Alexandra@epamail.epa.gov [mailto:Sullivan.Alexandra@epamail.epa.gov]

Sent: Friday, June 19, 2009 4:51 PM

To: Scarola, Thomas

Cc: Lupinacci.Jean@epamail.epa.gov; Hingea@aol.com; rplatt@rer.org;

Feuer, Josh

Subject: Fw: Energy Star Buildings in NYC - Issues in NY vs Nat'l

Portfolios

Hi Tom,

Jean forwarded me your email, and noted that you still had a number of technical questions regarding the ENERGY STAR ratings. I wanted to let you know that I will be up in New York City next week for Friday's hearing at the City Council. I will arrive around midday on Thursday, and would be able to meet with you that afternoon if you would like the opportunity to ask more specific detailed questions about our regression analysis and technical methodology. Any time from 2 pm onward will work for me.

Please let me know if you would find a meeting helpful and if you are available on Thursday afternoon.

Thank you,

Alexandra Sullivan

U.S. EPA

ENERGY STAR Mail Code 6202J Washington, DC 20460 202.343.9040 sullivan.alexandra@epa.gov

---- Forwarded by Alexandra Sullivan/DC/USEPA/US on 06/19/2009 04:43 PM ----

From:

Jean Lupinacci/DC/USEPA/US

To:

Alexandra Sullivan/DC/USEPA/US@EPA

Date:

06/19/2009 04:38 PM

Subject:

Fw: Energy Star Buildings in NYC - Issues in NY vs Nat'l

Portfolios

Jean Lupinacci U.S EPA 6202J Washington DC 20460

Phone : (202) 343-9137

Email : lupinacci.jean@epa.gov

www.energystar.gov

---- Forwarded by Jean Lupinacci/DC/USEPA/US on 06/19/2009 04:38 PM

From:

"Scarola, Thomas" <TScarola@TishmanSpeyer.com>

Jean Lupinacci/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, <Hingea@aol.com>, <rplatt@rer.org>, "Feuer, Josh" <JFeuer@TishmanSpeyer.com>

Date:

06/18/2009 03:52 PM

Subject: Portfolios Re: Energy Star Buildings in NYC - Issues in NY vs Nat'l

Jean,

Thanks for spending a few more minutes with me after the meeting yesterday. Maybe it gave me a chance to sound less belligerent and cranky. You obviously are open to making the tool answer all of its expectations and care deeply about it being meaningful in how it is applied.

I look forward to more conversations with you as we develop our thoughts and seek ways of achieving what appear to be mutual goals.

Regards, Tom

---- Original Message -----

From: Lupinacci.Jean@epamail.epa.gov < Lupinacci.Jean@epamail.epa.gov >

To: Hingea@aol.com <Hingea@aol.com>

Cc: Feuer, Josh; jim_green@hines.com <jim_green@hines.com>;

rbachia@brookfieldproperties.com <rbachia@brookfieldproperties.com>;

rplatt@rer.org <rplatt@rer.org>; Scarola, Thomas

Sent: Thu May 28 16:27:23 2009

Subject: Re: Energy Star Buildings in NYC - Issues in NY vs Nat'l

Portfolios

Adam,

Thank you for including me on the distribution of the email. If any questions arise as you proceed with this evaluation please let me know. We look forward to hearing any issues that may be identified.

Jean

Jean Lupinacci U.S EPA 6202J Washington DC 20460

Phone: (202) 343-9137

Email: lupinacci.jean@epa.gov

www.energystar.gov

From:

Hingea@aol.com

To: rbachia@brookfieldproperties.com, jim_green@hines.com, JFeuer@TishmanSpeyer.com, rplatt@rer.org

Cc:

Jean Lupinacci/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, tscarola@tishmanspeyer.com

Date:

05/27/2009 08:03 AM

Subject: Energy Star Buildings in NYC - Issues in NY vs Nat'l

As I've discussed with each of you in the past few weeks, a variety of questions still arise periodically about issues with Energy Star Portfolio Manager treatment of large office buildings in NYC.

With the prospect of some national legislation including reference to Energy Star, Roger Platt of the Real Estate Roundtable had asked me a couple of months ago about any ways to isolate which issues are real and might be addressed by EPA, vs what are remaining perception issues. As all of you have significant holdings in NYC and other cities around the US, and have benchmarked most (or all) of those buildings, you would have the best perspective on how NYC buildings might be operated and rated differently from those in other cities, and whether there are any substantive issues that we might identify for EPA's consideration.

Jim, as you're the only owner rep not based in NYC, could you let us know some days in the next week or two (beginning 6/1) that you'd be in NY and available to meet? If it would be easier to schedule a conference call instead of meeting in person, that is fine; please suggest some dates/times that would work.

Thanks, Adam

(See attached file: General_Overview_tech_methodology.pdf) (See attached file: office_tech_desc.pdf)

{In Archive} Re: Technical Descriptions

Alexandra Sullivan to: Alexandra Sullivan

Cc: Amatullah Rid, SLisauskas

Archive: This message is being viewed in an archive.

3	Alexandra Sullivan	Technical Descriptions
3	Alexandra Sullivan	attached. Alexandra Sullivan U.S. EPA
(3)	Lisauskas, Sara	Alexandra, I added one more alternate to your file. I have alway
9	Alexandra Sullivan	I like it! Good suggestion. I agree that we can leave the ra
23	Lisauskas, Sara	I have a meeting with two new people tomorrow that

attached.

Alexandra Sullivan

U.S. EPA **ENERGY STAR** Mail Code 6202J Washington, DC 20460 202.343.9040 sullivan.alexandra@epa.gov



TD_LookupOptions.doc

Alexandra Sullivan

Sara/Amatullah, It seems to me like in order to...

07/02/2009 12:20:57 PM

07/02/2009 12:24 PM

From:

Alexandra Sullivan/DC/USEPA/US

To:

Amatullah Rid/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, SLisauskas@icfi.com

Date:

07/02/2009 12:20 PM

Subject:

Technical Descriptions

Sara/Amatullah,

It seems to me like in order to make the paragraph in the technical descriptions read correctly we either need to have the lookup table start at 0, not "<smallest ratio", or we would need to word the paragraph differently.

Please see the attached and let me know what you think.

Thanks,

Alexandra Sullivan

U.S. EPA **ENERGY STAR** Mail Code 6202J Washington, DC 20460 202.343.9040 sullivan.alexandra@epa.gov

{In Archive} RE: Energy Star scores & occupancy levels

Alexandra Sullivan to: Cathy Turner

07/06/2009 02:32 PM

А	rchive: This	message is being viewed in an archive.
<u>Θ</u>	Mike Opitz	Energy Star scores & occupancy levels
3	Alexandra Sullivan	Mike, I am available any time on Friday 5/22.
0	Mike Opitz	Thank you Alexandra, this is very helpful. I'll propose a meeting i
à	Cathy Turner	Hi Corey - Is this call still on? I can't find the call in number
<u> </u>	Corey Enck	Hi Cathy, Let's use this number:

Cathy,

We will provide something soon. We are finalizing our review of spaces other than Office.

Thanks,

Alexandra Sullivan

U.S. EPA **ENERGY STAR** Mail Code 6202J Washington, DC 20460 202.343.9040 sullivan.alexandra@epa.gov

"Cathy Turner"

Hi Alexandra, We're still hoping to make any nee...

07/06/2009 01:52:45 PM

From:

"Cathy Turner" <cathyt@newbuildings.org> Alexandra Sullivan/DC/USEPA/US@EPA

To: Date:

07/06/2009 01:52 PM

Subject:

RE: Energy Star scores & occupancy levels

Hi Alexandra,

We're still hoping to make any needed EBOM calculator changes for allowing a higher % of vacant space later this month. Is your decision memo on planned PM changes available yet for USGBC review? Thanks!

Cathy

From: Sullivan.Alexandra@epamail.epa.gov [mailto:Sullivan.Alexandra@epamail.epa.gov]

Sent: Wednesday, May 27, 2009 5:45 AM

To: Cathy Turner Cc: 'Corey Enck'

Subject: RE: Energy Star scores & occupancy levels

[Both of Alexandra's corrections incorporated in the updated "original" note below]

I agree with these notes. I have two comments:

- 1. Vacant Office in PM should be entered as office with zero workers, PCs, and hours (I think the hours may have been missing from your note, this is the most important part).
- 2. I think this may be a type:

".Any LEED max vacancy limit is no higher than the EPA limit would be fine.", do you mean:

"Any LEED max vacancy limit is higher than the EPA limit would be fine."

Thanks for taking such good notes.

Alexandra Sullivan

U.S. EPA
ENERGY STAR
Mail Code 6202J
Washington, DC 20460
202.343.9040
sullivan.alexandra@epa.gov

From: "Cathy Turner" <cathyt@newbuildings.org>

To: "'Corey Enck'" < cenck@usgbc.org > , Alexandra

Sullivan/DC/USEPA/US@EPA

Date: 05/26/2009 08:41 PM

Subject: RE: Energy Star scores & occupancy levels

Thought I should get the key points from my scribbled notes from our call transferred to some place that I might be able to find and read them in the future. Let me know if you have any changes / additions. Thanks!

--- Corrected version:

EPA / Energy Star treatment of vacant space

- 1. Expect changes to be implemented in an August or September PM mini-release. Decision/Analysis memo should be available by end of June.
- 2. Vacancy limits currently apply for E* only to office and hotel space types. That will probably continue to be the case, but they are reviewing the other types to confirm. Medical office would be one of the most likely other types to also be included in the revision.
- 3. Max allowable vacant space for offices may be dropped to 50%. Testing shows that their proposed approach is fairly robust down that level.

4. For offices, will require vacant and occupied areas to be entered as separate spaces within the building, with 0 for each of hours, occupants, and PC's in the vacant area.

USGBC / EB considerations (energy-related)
5. Could announce a change in the EBOM vacancy requirement in July (after the EPA E* decision is known, but a month or two before the change is actually implemented in PM). Any LEED max vacancy limit that is no higher than the EPA limit would be fine. (e.g., if EPA goes to 50% vacancy, LEED could stay at 75% or drop to 60%.)

- 6. For E*-eligible buildings (EBOM 2009 Case 1), no need to change the offline (Case 2) calculator. [Note, this assumes USGBC is comfortable with no E*rating adjustments for different vacancy levels in the unaffected types (#2 above). Seems a reasonable assumption, given the EPA review process, but could confirm after their analysis memo is available.]
- 7. For Case 2 buildings, probably want to add a requirement to the offline calculator that vacant space be separately identified, at least if it exceeds x%. Will need to do some sensitivity and reasonability testing to make sure the point impacts look reasonable and don't create a sharp discontinuity in ratings for vacancy levels just above and below x%.

My preliminary recommendation here was that the calculator use the source EUI for "general storage" (56 source kBtu/sf) as the Nat'l Avg for the vacant spaces. This is less than half of the CBECS average for most space types, (e.g. 102 source kBtu/sf for social/meeting, 246 for library). Probably on the conservative side (e.g. a lower national average benchmark than might be argued for), but we don't have data to make a more refined or accurate estimate. I'm assuming that the same vacant EUI would make sense for all non-E* types. The EUI differences by type come primarily from differences in schedule and plug/equipment loads. Those things should apply only to the occupied space. Other thoughts?

8. Plan to implement these changes in the offline calculator in July (assuming the USGBC announcement of vacancy changes will happen about then). ALSO, update the Case 1 / Case 2 type lists at the same time to reflect that Religious Worship will be moving to the Case 1 (E* eligible) type as of the end of July.

----Original Message----

From: Mike Opitz [?mailto:mopitz@usgbc.org]

Sent: Monday, May 11, 2009 10:31 AM To: Sullivan.Alexandra@epamail.epa.gov

Cc: Cathy Turner; Corey Enck

Subject: RE: Energy Star scores & occupancy levels

Thank you Alexandra, this is very helpful. I'll propose a meeting for us soon.

----Original Message-----

From: Sullivan.Alexandra@epamail.epa.gov [mailto:Sullivan.Alexandra@epamail.epa.gov:]

Sent: Monday, May 11, 2009 11:47 AM

To: Mike Opitz

Cc: Cathy Turner; Corey Enck

Subject: Re: Energy Star scores & occupancy levels

Mike,

I am available any time on Friday 5/22.

EPA is working to finalize our analysis of this issue. As a preview of our review: given the adjustments for hours of operation, worker density and PC density, we believe that the office rating model will work well and compute accurate ratings at lower occupancy levels. The only requirement is that the vacant space should be input with zero hours of operation.

Because we do not work as much with new buildings, the occupancy question is less of an issue for other space types. But, these are under review, too. I do not think we will develop requirements for spaces such as retail stores, hospitals or schools. These do not typically have high vacancy levels.

Thanks, Alexandra Sullivan

U.S. EPA
ENERGY STAR
Mail Code 6202J
Washington, DC 20460
202.343.9040
sullivan.alexandra@epa.gov

From:

"Mike Opitz" <mopitz@usgbc.org>

To: "Cathy Turner" < cathyt@newbuildings.org, Alexandra Sullivan/DC/USEPA/US@EPA

Cc: "Corey Enck" <cenck@usgbc.org>

Date:

05/11/2009 11:41 AM

Subject:

Energy Star scores & occupancy levels

Hello Cathy and Alexandra:

Hope things are going well your way.

Corey and I are interested in having a follow-up technical discussion with both of you on one of the items we discussed together at our meeting a few months back: the sensitivity of Energy Star scores to occupancy levels for some applications, and whether defining more boundaries on that issue makes sense for our respective programs. Are there any good times in the near future that you could meet with us on this?

Thank you,

Mike Opitz PE, LEED Accredited Professional
Vice President, LEED Implementation
U.S. Green Building Council
2101 L Street NW | Suite 500 | Washington DC 20037
202.828.7422 (main)
202.742.3744 (direct)
MOpitz@usgbc.org



Archive:

{In Archive} RE: office occupancies

Mike Opitz to: Alexandra Sullivan

Cc: "Corey Enck"

This message is being viewed in an archive.

07/08/2009 03:20 PM

2	Mike Opitz	office occupancies
3	Alexandra Sullivan	Mike, I am available Wednesday or Thursday after 2 pm. I will be of
À	Mike Opitz	Alexandra, these days aren't so good on my end. How's next Mo
3	Alexandra Sullivan	Mike, I am free on Monday 7/13 after 2pm.
න	Mike Opitz	Great, I just sent an invite for Monday at 4. Talk to y

Great, I just sent an invite for Monday at 4. Talk to you then.

Mike

----Original Message----

From: Sullivan.Alexandra@epamail.epa.gov [mailto:Sullivan.Alexandra@epamail.epa.gov] Sent: Wednesday, July 08, 2009 2:39 PM

To: Mike Opitz Cc: Corey Enck

Subject: RE: office occupancies

Mike,

I am free on Monday 7/13 after 2pm.

On Tuesday 7/14 I am free anytime EXCEPT 2-3.

Hopefully there is something that works for you in one of those windows.

Thanks,

Alexandra Sullivan

U.S. EPA
ENERGY STAR
Mail Code 6202J
Washington, DC 20460
202.343.9040
sullivan.alexandra@epa.gov

From:

"Mike Opitz" <mopitz@usgbc.org>

To:

Alexandra Sullivan/DC/USEPA/US@EPA

Cc:

"Corey Enck" <cenck@usgbc.org>

Date:

07/08/2009 09:20 AM

Subject: RE: office occupancies

Alexandra, these days aren't so good on my end. How's next Mon or Tues for you?

Mike

----Original Message-----

From: Sullivan.Alexandra@epamail.epa.gov [mailto:Sullivan.Alexandra@epamail.epa.gov]

Sent: Tuesday, July 07, 2009 6:09 PM

To: Mike Opitz Cc: Corey Enck

Subject: Re: office occupancies

Mike,

I am available Wednesday or Thursday after 2 pm. I will be out on Friday.

We have decided to change our policy and I can summarize this decision for you.

Thank you,

Alexandra Sullivan

U.S. EPA
ENERGY STAR
Mail Code 6202J
Washington, DC 20460
202.343.9040
sullivan.alexandra@epa.gov

From: "Mike Opitz" <mopitz@usgbc.org>

To: Alexandra Sullivan/DC/USEPA/US@EPA

Cc: "Corey Enck" <cenck@usgbc.org>

Date: 07/07/2009 04:57 PM

Subject: office occupancies

Hi Alexandra:

I'd be interested in a short call later this week to check in on this topic. Could you talk with Corey and I sometime this Friday? If so, let me know and I'll propose a time.

Take care,

Mike Opitz PE, LEED Accredited Professional Vice President, LEED Implementation & Maintenance U.S. Green Building Council 2101 L Street NW | Suite 500 | Washington DC 20037 202.828.7422 (main) 202.742.3744 (direct) MOpitz@usgbc.org

{In Archive} RE: Technical Descriptions

Alexandra Sullivan to: Lisauskas, Sara

Cc: Amatullah Rid

Archive:

This message is being viewed in an archive.

3	Alexandra Sullivan	Technical Descriptions
3	Alexandra Sullivan	attached. Alexandra Sullivan U.S. EPA
ia i	Lisauskas, Sara	Alexandra, I added one more alternate to your file. I have alway
3	Alexandra Sullivan	I like it! Good suggestion. I agree that we can leave the ra
۵	Lisauskas, Sara	I have a meeting with two new people tomorrow that

Sara,

The word docs for the other EUI models are attached. I am trying to wrap up the web changes in general as soon as possible. So if you have someone who can correct the tables and the corresponding paragraph by next Wednesday, 7/15, that would be great!

Thanks,

Alexandra Sullivan

U.S. EPA ENERGY STAR Mail Code 6202J Washington, DC 20460 202.343.9040 sullivan.alexandra@epa.gov



"Lisauskas, Sara"

I have a meeting with two new people tomorrow...

07/08/2009 02:48:28 PM

07/08/2009 03:53 PM



{In Archive} Re: Sensitivity call

Amatullah Rid to: Alexandra Sullivan

07/16/2009 10:57 AM

Archive:

This message is being viewed in an archive.

<u> </u>	Lisauskas, Sara	Sensitivity call
<i>3</i>	Alexandra Sullivan	Sara, I am available at any time tomorrow. Amatullah will be out, but I
ā	Lisauskas, Sara	OK, sounds goodOriginal Message
മ	Amatullah Rid	No worries. thanks Amatullah R'id U.S. EPA

No worries, thanks

Amatullah R'id U.S. EPA **ENERGY STAR Commercial and Industrial Branch** Office of Air and Radiation Mail Code 6202J Washington, DC 20460 202.343.9097 rid.amatullah@epa.gov

Alexandra Sullivan

Sara, I am available at any time tomorrow. Am...

07/16/2009 10:47:57 AM

From:

Alexandra Sullivan/DC/USEPA/US

To:

"Lisauskas, Sara" <SLisauskas@icfi.com>

Cc:

Amatullah Rid/DC/USEPA/US@EPA

Date:

07/16/2009 10:47 AM

Subject:

Re: Sensitivity call

Sara,

I am available at any time tomorrow. Amatullah will be out, but I can fill her in on our decisions next week.

Shall we say 2 pm?

Alexandra Sullivan

U.S. EPA **ENERGY STAR** Mail Code 6202J Washington, DC 20460 202.343.9040 sullivan.alexandra@epa.gov

"Lisauskas, Sara"

I'm still running behind on the sensitivity analysi...

07/16/2009 10:45:02 AM



{In Archive} RE: ENERGY STAR and Office Occupancy

Mike Opitz to: Alexandra Sullivan
Cc: "Corey Enck", Michael Zatz

This message is being viewed in an archive.

07/20/2009 04:00 PM

		age is somig viewed in an archive.
3	Alexandra Sullivan	ENERGY STAR and Office Occupancy
2	Michael Zatz	Thanks for copying me. Mike Zatz
	Mike Opitz	Thank you Alexandra, this is very helpful guidance. Given your decision

Thank you Alexandra, this is very helpful guidance. Given your decision, we'll be offering this same option to our LEED Existing Buildings customers too. We have what we need to proceed on that, and we'll do so, enabling it later this summer. We'll fold your technical guidance on the inputs into our process to help ensure customers get it right.

If you can update us on when you've finished developing your formal written direction and on revising your labeling process that would be helpful too - we'd like to just reference your content whenever that makes sense.

Thank you again for all your help with this. It's a good change, and a needed one in this soft market.

Mike

----Original Message----

From: Sullivan.Alexandra@epamail.epa.gov [mailto:Sullivan.Alexandra@epamail.epa.gov]

Sent: Sunday, July 19, 2009 6:05 PM

To: Mike Opitz

Cc: Corey Enck; Zatz.Michael@epamail.epa.gov
Subject: ENERGY STAR and Office Occupancy

Mike,

It was nice to speak with you last week, and I wanted to follow-up with a written explanation of our change in policy:

1. Occupancy for Offices - EPA will be lowering its requirement for

Office Occupancy. To earn an accurate rating and apply for the

label, a building will be required to maintain an average annual

occupancy of more than 50%.

Buildings will be required to enter their vacant space separate

from their occupied space. Vacant space should be entered with

zero workers, zero hours, and zero personal computers (PCs). The

vacant space should be entered with zero hours even if it is

conditioned. The assumption is that most buildings will have some

conditioning in the vacant space (e.g. to maintain adequate

ventilation and interior conditions for showing the space to

prospective tenants, or because ventilation systems do not allow

the vacant portion to be completely shut off).

This change in policy was based on a simulation of buildings to

explore how energy use may be expected to change when occupancy

levels decline (or, when vacancy increases).

It was determined

that if the workers, hours, and PCs are listed as zero, the office

model is able to account for the vacant space and provide a fair

assessment of the building. As such, the occupancy level required

to receive an accurate rating and a label will be changed. Office

buildings will be required to maintain an average annual occupancy of more than 50%.

2. Occupancy for Hotels- The occupancy level for hotels was

originally set at an average annual occupancy of 55%. This level

was based on information about typical hotel operating conditions

and was determined to be a baseline requirement for consideration

as a full-time hotel. At this time EPA is not pursuing any

changes to this requirement.

3. Occupancy for all other spaces - The other spaces that \mbox{EPA} rates

are not typically leased in pieces. For example, schools,

hospitals, and retail stores are not subject to partial leases.

Hence, there is no need for EPA to create an occupancy

requirement. EPA will not institute new occupancy requirements

for any spaces other than hotels and offices.

EPA is currently preparing documentation for our web team to modify the label application process so that it will allow Offices to apply for the label when they have more than 50 but less than 75 percent occupancy. Please note that Offices can already receive accurate ratings if they enter the workers, hours, and PCs of the vacant space as zero. Thus, EPA is already directing users to do this through user support, and is working on formal written direction.

Once our software team has reviewed the technical specifications, we will inform you of the final timeline. Note that buildings that are more than 50 but less than 75 percent occupied can already apply for LEED with accurate ratings as long as the vacant portions are entered correctly.

Please let me know if you have any questions,

Alexandra Sullivan

U.S. EPA
ENERGY STAR
Mail Code 6202J
Washington, DC 20460
202.343.9040
sullivan.alexandra@epa.gov



{In Archive} Re: Fw: Servers Included with Number of PCs?

Amatullah Rid to: Alexandra Sullivan

09/02/2009 04:13 PM

Archive:

This message is being viewed in an archive.

3	Alexandra Sullivan	Amatullah, They can include servers in the count except that they sho
ت	Amatullah Rid	should we update the link?? Amatullah R'id
3	Alexandra Sullivan	Since the link doesn't say not to include servers, I think it is
ت	Amatullah Rid	ok. tx. Amatullah R'id U.S. EPA

ok. tx.

Amatullah R'id
U.S. EPA
ENERGY STAR Commercial and Industrial Branch
Office of Air and Radiation
Mail Code 6202J
Washington, DC 20460
202.343.9097
rid.amatullah@epa.gov

Alexandra Sullivan

Since the link doesn't say not to include servers,...

09/02/2009 04:12:24 PM

From:

Alexandra Sullivan/DC/USEPA/US Amatullah Rid/DC/USEPA/US@EPA

To: Date:

09/02/2009 04:12 PM

Subject:

Re: Fw: Servers Included with Number of PCs?

Since the link doesn't say **not** to include servers, I think it is okay to leave this. We have a very long list of small updates and text changes, in PM... and this one will not top the priority list any time soon. Since there is no wrong information, I think it is okay to leave it.

Alexandra Sullivan

U.S. EPA ENERGY STAR Mail Code 6202J Washington, DC 20460 202.343.9040 sullivan.alexandra@epa.gov

Amatullah Rid

should we update the link?? Amatullah R'id

09/02/2009 04:10:23 PM

Alexandra Sullivan

Amatullah, They can include servers in the cou...

09/02/2009 04:09:26 PM

Amatullah Rid

Alexandra, We got a question from a user on wh...

09/02/2009 04:07:44 PM



{In Archive} Re: Fw: Operating hours / vacancy FAQs - Supporting Documents $\hfill \Box$

Amatullah Rid to: Alexandra Sullivan Co: Alyssa Quarforth

09/23/2009 09:37 AM

Histor	ry: This mess	sage has been replied to.	
Archiv		This message is being viewed in an archive.	
ß	Alyssa Quarforth	Fw: Operating hours / vacancy FAQs - Supporting Documents	
<i>3</i> !	Alexandra Sullivan	Aly, We need to meet about this today. Right now this is scheduled to	
۵	Alyssa Quarforth	I am free all day today except at 10am and from 1-3pm. I wasn't	
ā	Amatullah Rid	Alexandra, FYI. I have begun updating the PE Guide. When do I	
9	Alexandra Sullivan	Great, thanks! Why don't you bring what you have to our n	

Alexandra,

FYI. I have begun updating the PE Guide. When do I need to send the final language to you?

Amatullah R'id
U.S. EPA
ENERGY STAR Commercial and Industrial Branch
Office of Air and Radiation
Mail Code 6202J
Washington, DC 20460
202.343.9097
rid.amatullah@epa.gov

Alexandra Sullivan Alyssa Quarforth Aly, We need to meet about this today. Right n... Alexandra, Attached below are the new FAQs w...

09/23/2009 08:57:45 AM 09/17/2009 05:14:52 PM



{In Archive} Re: Fw: Operating hours / vacancy FAQs - Supporting Documents

Amatullah Rid to: Alexandra Sullivan

09/23/2009 09:45 AM

Archive:

This message is being viewed in an archive.

Ž)	Alyssa Quarforth	Fw: Operating hours / vacancy FAQs - Supporting Documents
⊒ !	Alexandra Sullivan	Aly, We need to meet about this today. Right now this is scheduled to
ß	Alyssa Quarforth	I am free all day today except at 10am and from 1-3pm. I wasn't
Ē	Amatullah Rid	Alexandra, FYI. I have begun updating the PE Guide. When do I
9	Alexandra Sullivan	Great, thanks! Why don't you bring what you have to our n

It won't be finalized because I am working on a few other things, but I will definitely bring what I have.

Amatullah R'id
U.S. EPA
ENERGY STAR Commercial and Industrial Branch
Office of Air and Radiation
Mail Code 6202J
Washington, DC 20460
202.343.9097
rid.amatullah@epa.gov

Alexandra Sullivan

Great, thanks! Why don't you bring what you ha...

09/23/2009 09:42:52 AM

From: To:

Alexandra Sullivan/DC/USEPA/US Amatullah Rid/DC/USEPA/US@EPA

Date:

09/23/2009 09:42 AM

Subject:

Re: Fw: Operating hours / vacancy FAQs - Supporting Documents

Great, thanks!

Why don't you bring what you have to our meeting at 3 pm. Then we'll outline the remaining tasks and all the (tight) deadlines and milestones we'll need to complete everything by tomorrow.

Alexandra Sullivan

U.S. EPA ENERGY STAR Mail Code 6202J Washington, DC 20460 202.343.9040 sullivan.alexandra@epa.gov

> Amatullah Rid Alexandra Sullivan

Alexandra, FYI. I have begun updating the PE G... Aly, We need to meet about this today. Right n...

09/23/2009 09:37:06 AM 09/23/2009 08:57:45 AM 09/17/2009 05:14:52 PM

Alyssa Quarforth

Alexandra, Attached below are the new FAQs w...

{In Archive} Re: 50% occupancy

Alexandra Sullivan to: Sherri Levin

09/25/2009 05:40 PM

Archive:

This message is being viewed in an archive.

Ė	Sherri Levin	50% occupancy
3	Alexandra Sullivan	Sherri, The change goes live at the end of the day on Tuesday 9/29.

Sherri,

The change goes live at the end of the day on Tuesday 9/29. It has been announced as an upcoming change in Aly's newsletter. But, the new FAQ and Help Language will not go live until the change happens.

Thanks,

Alexandra Sullivan

U.S. EPA ENERGY STAR Mail Code 6202J Washington, DC 20460 202.343.9040 sullivan.alexandra@epa.gov

"Sherri Levin"

Hi Alex,

09/25/2009 04:43:38 PM

From: To: "Sherri Levin" <slevin@manageenergy.com> Alexandra Sullivan/DC/USEPA/US@EPA

Date: Subject: 09/25/2009 04:43 PM 50% occupancy

Hi Alex.

Has the occupancy requirement for CRE been officially reduced to 50%? Is it posted anywhere yet?

Thanks so much, Sherri Levin

[Note to myself: send answer to Paul Nangle pnangle@enviregy.com]

Dr. Sherri L. Levin, MBA, CPA

PO Box 3368 Annapolis, MD 21403 410.974.6858 Voice 340.715.4955 Fax



Archive

{In Archive} RE: FAQs on occupancy

Hughes, Jennifer to: Alexandra Sullivan

Cc: "Kent, Justin"

This message is being viewed in an archive.

Alexandra Sullivan

Fw: FAQs on occupancy

Hughes, Jennifer

Alexandra - this is on our agenda for tomorrow. Thanks,

Alexandra - this is on our agenda for tomorrow.

Thanks,

Jennifer C. Hughes

IT Project Manager 3434 Washington Blvd. Arlington, VA 22201 (0) 703-284-6936 (c) 703-786-5311 Jennifer Hughes@SRA.com

This electronic message transmission contains information from SRA International, Inc. which may be confidential, privileged, or proprietary. The information is intended for the use of the individual or entity named above. If you are not the intended recipient, be aware that any disclosure, copying, distribution, or use of the contents of this information is strictly prohibited. If you have received this electronic information in error, please notify us immediately by telephone at 866-584-2143.

----Original Message----

From: Sullivan.Alexandra@epamail.epa.gov [mailto:Sullivan.Alexandra@epamail.epa.gov] Sent: Tuesday, October 06, 2009 6:50 PM

To: Hughes, Jennifer

Cc: Kent, Justin

Subject: Fw: FAQs on occupancy

Jennifer,

10/07/2009 04:03 PM

I'd like to understand why the searches that Aly describes below do not bring up the new FAQs that we created. Can we look into this and discuss at our meeting on Thursday? Also, I'd like to add the link she describes even though I understand that this was NOT in our original guidance, as she suggests. Thank you, Alexandra Sullivan U.S. EPA ENERGY STAR Mail Code 6202J Washington, DC 20460 202.343.9040 sullivan.alexandra@epa.gov ---- Forwarded by Alexandra Sullivan/DC/USEPA/US on 10/06/2009 06:48 PM |----> From: |----> Alyssa Quarforth/DC/USEPA/US >-----|----> To: |----> -----Alexandra Sullivan/DC/USEPA/US@EPA >-----______ Cc: >-----

Amatullah Rid/DC/USEPA/US@EPA
> Date:
>
10/06/2009 05:35 PM
> Subject: >
>
FAQs on occupancy
>
Hello,
My team and I recently discovered that you can not find the FAQs we created on the new occupancy rule for offices if you try to search for "vacant space", "occupancy" or "operating hours".
Also, it is hard to

find the FAQ "how to enter vacant space in your office building" because the first FAQ we link to off of the PM log in page

titled "

Is my office building required to achieve a minimum level of ${}^{\circ}$

occupancy in order to earn the ENERGY STAR?

does not link to the second (and most important) FAQ on how to enter in vacant space. It just says, for more information read the FAQ on vacant space.

I thought we instructed SRA to link the two FAQs? Also, can we modify the search function so that when you search for key words like "occupancy" and "vacant space" the second FAQ comes up?

Thanks, Aly

Alyssa Quarforth Program Manager ENERGY STAR, Commercial Properties Climate Protection Partnerships Division, US EPA

Mail Code: 6202J Washington DC 20460 202.343.9604 Quarforth.Alyssa@epa.gov



{In Archive} Re: FAQs

Amatullah Rid to: Alexandra Sullivan

11/16/2009 05:18 PM

Archive:

This message is being viewed in an archive.

Amatullah Rid 2 **FAQs** Alexandra Sullivan I think you still need to switch the "at least' to "more than" in the attache Amatullah Rid Yes, copied directly. thx Amatullah R'id U.S. EPA 8

Yes, copied directly. thx

Amatullah R'id U.S. EPA **ENERGY STAR Commercial and Industrial Branch** Office of Air and Radiation Mail Code 6202J Washington, DC 20460 202.343.9097 rid.amatullah@epa.gov

Alexandra Sullivan

I think you still need to switch the "at least' to "m...

11/16/2009 05:14:06 PM

From:

Alexandra Sullivan/DC/USEPA/US Amatullah Rid/DC/USEPA/US@EPA

To: Date:

11/16/2009 05:14 PM

Subject:

Re: FAQs

I think you still need to switch the "at least' to "more than" in the attached.

Otherwise, your format seems fine. I assume you used copy/paste from the tool, so I only skimmed them.

Thanks.

Alexandra Sullivan

U.S. EPA **ENERGY STAR** Mail Code 6202J Washington, DC 20460 202.343.9040 sullivan.alexandra@epa.gov

Amatullah Rid

Alexandra, I just wanted to run these by you first... 11/16/2009 12:59:28 PM

{In Archive} Re: Technical Direction for Office and Retail Adjustments

Alexandra Sullivan to: Lisauskas, Sara

12/10/2009 05:56 PM

Cc: Amatullah Rid, "Elliott, Douglas", "Greenburg, Seth"

Archive: This message is being viewed in an archive.

à	Lisauskas, Sara	Technical Direction for Office and Retail Adjustments
⋾!	Alexandra Sullivan	Sara, In the Excel file you attached, I noticed that you actually did use
=	Alexandra Sullivan	Sara, In case you want to review what I did, please use these up
2	Lisauskas, Sara	Look at these versions of the files instead. I hadn't saved
ف	Lisauskas, Sara	I did catch a minor error in the calculations. You had chan

Sara.

In case you want to review what I did, please use these updated attached versions. I went through with a second round of edits. I didn't see any other error in the calculations, but did correct a few things and make some language changes.

Thanks,

Alexandra Sullivan

U.S. EPA ENERGY STAR Mail Code 6202J Washington, DC 20460 202.343.9040 sullivan.alexandra@epa.gov





Alexandra Sullivan

Sara, In the Excel file you attached, I noticed th...

12/09/2009 09:40:22 PM 12/09/2009 07:59:50 AM

"Lisauskas, Sara" Al

Alexandra.

{In Archive} Wastewater and Office/Retail Guidance Docs

Alexandra Sullivan to: Amatullah Rid

12/10/2009 11:02 PM

А	rchive: This mess	This message is being viewed in an archive.	
3	Alexandra Sullivan	Wastewater and Office/Retail Guidance Docs	
3	Alexandra Sullivan	Amatullah, Please don't worry about the Office/Retail. If you are	
<u>a</u>	Amatullah Rid	My edits are attached. Overall, it looks good.Amatullah R'i	
9	Alexandra Sullivan	Thanks! With respect to the eligibility, they don't nee	

Amatullah,

If you have the time, please read these and offer any comments by 11 am tomorrow. If you're not able to look at them in that time frame, just let me know.

Thanks,

Alexandra Sullivan

U.S. EPA **ENERGY STAR** Mail Code 6202J Washington, DC 20460 202.343.9040 sullivan.alexandra@epa.gov





Direction_Office and Retail_20091210.doc Water and Wastewater Modifications.doc

{In Archive} Re: Wastewater and Office/Retail Guidance Docs

Alexandra Sullivan to: Amatullah Rid

12/11/2009 01:13 PM

А	rchive:	This message is being viewed in an archive.		
3	Alexandra S	Sullivan	Wastewater and Office/Retail Guidance Docs	
3	Alexandra Sullivan		Amatullah, Please don't worry about the Office/Retail. If you are	
à	Amatullah Rid		My edits are attached. Overall, it looks good.Amatullah R'i	
3	Alexandra S	Sullivan	Thanks! With respect to the eligibility, they don't nee	
	The second secon			

Thanks!

With respect to the eligibility, they don't need to have the same meter entry start/end dates for each reading for the flow meter and energy meters. But, ultimately they need to have both data for the EUI. I think this is covered at the end, where I say that SRA is responsible for updating the web, help, and eligibility rules. So I think we're okay for this doc. But, you raise a good point, which I will make a note to point out when we meet with SRA to go over the changes.

Alexandra Sullivan

U.S. EPA ENERGY STAR Mail Code 6202J Washington, DC 20460 202.343.9040 sullivan.alexandra@epa.gov

Amatullah Rid

My edits are attached. Overall, it looks good.Am...

12/11/2009 12:56:40 PM

From:

Amatullah Rid/DC/USEPA/US

To:

Alexandra Sullivan/DC/USEPA/US@EPA

Date:

12/11/2009 12:56 PM

Subject:

Re: Wastewater and Office/Retail Guidance Docs

My edits are attached. Overall, it looks good.[attachment "Water and Wastewater Modifications_AR.doc" deleted by Alexandra Sullivan/DC/USEPA/US]

Amatullah R'id
U.S. EPA
ENERGY STAR Commercial and Industrial Branch
Office of Air and Radiation
Mail Code 6202J
Washington, DC 20460
202.343.9097
rid.amatullah@epa.gov

Alexandra Sullivan

Amatullah, Please don't worry about the Office/...

12/11/2009 12:18:02 PM 12/11/2009 11:32:10 AM

Amatullah Rid

Sorry I am just seeing this email right now. I just...